

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/966,604	BENVENISTE, VICTOR M.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Amy He	2858	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Amy He. (3) _____.

(2) Sean D. Detweiler. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08/17/2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3,5-17,19 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Morrison Jr. (U. S. Patent No. 4, 714,891) and Booth et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5, 936,413).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner contacted applicant's attorney Mr. Sean Detweiler on August 17, 2004 for an interview to discuss the Morrison reference cited in last office action and the newly found Booth reference. It was agreed that the Morrison reference lacks a filter, and the Booth reference lacks a probe within a plasma chamber. Mr. Detweiler authorized the examiner to prepare an examiner's amendment to cancel claims 2, 17, 19 and 20; and amend the probe device of claim 1 to include the limitation that the probe device is adapted for extending at least partly within the plasma chamber. In addition, it was noted that the examiner's copy(scanned copy of applicant's amended claim page filed on January 6, 2004) of claim 12 (an original claim) has the "probe body..." limitation missing from the claim.